

# EXHIBIT A

**From:** Jeffrey Peterson <jp@jeffreypeterson.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 3, 2018 2:15 PM  
**To:** Mahoney, William <WMahoney@STRADLEY.COM>  
**Subject:** Phone call and introduction

---

**External Email - Think Before You Click**

Attn: William E. Mahoney Jr.

Hi Bill,

As promised, sending a follow-up note by email. Thanks for taking a few minutes to speak by phone today. Thought it may be interesting for you and I to discuss certain items of possible mutual interest.

First, I will comment regarding litigation you and your colleagues recently initiated v. Key Commercial Finance, Billingsley et. al. in Delaware District Court, civil case no. 18-1516-UNA. As we discussed in our phone call today, I downloaded and your initial document filings (documents filed Oct.1 and 2) from PACER and reviewed those filings briefly. Without commenting as to the factual correctness or incorrectness of anything contained in those documents, I will note it does seem certain language within your complaint was influenced by my former colleague and current adversary, former U.S. Attorney Dennis K. Burke. I feel Burke may be using your firm and your current litigation to help his own personal agenda relating to Mobile Corp., a business venture I have been involved with for a number of years, and in which the legal entities you represent relating to a certain individual (Frank Pavlis?) may have certain interests. More on Mobile Corp. and Pavlis in a minute. First, I will write about Dennis Burke.

Dennis and I worked together in Arizona under Gov. Janet Napolitano for a period of years. One of Dennis's current business partners, Marco Lopez, was my close business colleague and friend for more than ten years. Needless to say, I was very close to Dennis and his "inner circle" for a significant period of time. You may or may not be aware that Mr. Burke is considered a black sheep within the legal community by certain of his former colleagues.

It is factually correct to note that Dennis Burke was forced to resign his position as U.S. Attorney on about August of 2011, in the wake of the "Fast and Furious" gun running/arms trafficking scandal that is still the subject of ongoing federal Government inquiries in Washington, D.C. See: "Burke's exit clouds his future", [politico.com](http://politico.com), Aug. 30, 2011 URL: <https://www.politico.com/story/2011/08/burkes-exit-clouds-his-future-062370>  
"His [Burke's] departure as U.S. Attorney comes as congressional investigators and an internal Justice Department inquiry are examining how an Arizona-based federal gun-trafficking investigation may have allowed as many as 2,000 guns to flow to criminals."

In mid-2013, the Inspector General's office of the Justice Department criticized Burke as the result of an inquiry regarding the gun trafficking investigation known as Operation Fast and Furious. See: "Ex-U.S. Attorney in Arizona Is Criticized for Leak to Fox" New York Times. May 20, 2013.  
URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/21/us/politics/dennis-k-burke-criticized-for-fast-and-furious-leak.html> "He [the Inspector General] called [Burke's] actions "particularly egregious" misconduct that was "wholly unbecoming a U.S. attorney. . .The inspector general's report criticized Mr. Burke for taking matters into his own hands, portraying him as inappropriately seeking to undermine and retaliate against Mr. Dodson, and accusing Mr. Burke of violating several department regulations. It suggested that the department's ethics office review whether to file a professional misconduct complaint with the bar. . .Mr. Burke declined to comment, through his lawyer."

"[Deputy Attorney General James Cole] "could not get a clear answer from Burke about whether he had authorized the release" and concluded Mr. Burke had lied to him," according to the DOJ Inspector General's report.

Dennis Burke was reprimanded by the Arizona State Bar on or about March of 2014. See: "Fast and Furious's last, tragic word" March 28, 2014 URL: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/opinion/editorial/2014/03/28/fast-furious-dennis-burke-reprimand/7001443/> "For having released a pair of classified documents – and, clumsily, he admits, lying about it, at first -- the state bar has issued Burke a reprimand."

As can be seen by the above paragraphs, it has been established in the press and at least one official Dept. of Justice report, that disgraced former U.S. Attorney Dennis Burke has a pattern of lying in matters relating to retaliation

**P-03565**

Bill, as you know, the first time you and I have ever spoke, was today, by telephone. It was my pleasure to make your acquaintance as I am hopeful we can somehow assist each other in our respective endeavors. If not, so be it. However, it appears you will be pursuing aggressive complex litigation vs. Mr. Billingsley and certain of his entities on behalf of your client(s); I am not sure exactly whom your clients are nor do I believe it makes much difference to any of my interests, unless you are somehow partnered with Dennis Burke in your litigation. I do not imagine you would have partnered with Dennis, he usually prefers to be "invisible" . . . "in the background" influencing things where he cannot be seen or detected.

Burke is probably using your firm, and your litigation, to try to create the appearance of an independent, third-party lawsuit that was drafted with no influence from him, that alleges instances of fraud relating to myself -and- Billingsley, with hopes to deliver your lawsuit and such "fraud characterizations" to law enforcement personnel and advance his retaliatory agenda, primarily against myself while encumbering the Mobile Corp. business project at the same time.

In this case, however, reading through your documents, although you may not be "partnered" with Dennis Burke in the sense of actual "on the record" legal representation, I do see what I believe to be Mr. Burke's wordsmithing, in the form of his usual scathing anger and mischaracterizations of historical events relating to Mobile Corp. I will go so far as to say, it is doubtful to me that those mischaracterizations will be helpful to your case. I think Dennis is using you, your firm, and the documents that were filed, to try to call attention from his friends in Federal Law Enforcement, as he's been trying to do for the past three or more years, to attack/retaliate against myself and/or Mobile Corp., and to prevent Mobile Corp. from making forward progress or a recovery.

I would imagine Mr. Burke has already printed copies of the documents you filed, and is on his way to his local FBI / U.S. Attorney friends to -yet again- visit them, (as he has been for years now), pointing to a "legal document" where myself and others may have been characterized as charlatans and fraudsters -- accusations that will not survive a legitimate investigation. But Burke, as desperate as he is at this point, doesn't care about legitimate investigations -- he wants law enforcement attention...to borrow from his own statements, "as much "heat" as possible. . . on Peterson."

Finally, I will share the following two links. One is to a "hit piece" news article orchestrated and manufactured by Burke himself, that ran in the Arizona Republic Newspaper in December of 2017. In the "hit piece" news article, Burke & various individuals coerced by Burke allege that some sort of improper corporate conduct occurred at Mobile Corp., including but not limited to "unauthorized" funds transfers were supposedly made to an entity controlled by me.

Hit piece news article link: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona-investigations/2017/12/14/once-high-flying-quepasa-chief-jeff-peterson-under-fire-from-investors-in-startups/662692001/>

The following is a audio presentation including actual authorized audio recordings from Board of Directors meetings in the history of Mobile Corp., evidencing Mr. Burke's own Board of Directors votes to authorize the same transactions that were stated to be "unauthorized" by the "hit piece" news article captioned above.

Audio presentation link: <https://vimeo.com/283357131/84029bb7b1>

If you take a moment to review the above news article, and listen to the above audio recording, you now have proof in your hands that Burke probably lied to you regarding material facts pertaining to the corporate history of Mobile Corp., and his own involvement. It is quite complex and of course I have all of the true details -- not his fabricated lies that he tries to get on the record as "official court documents" with hopes to make his dream of having myself and Michael Silberman arrested by the FBI, come true. He apparently doesn't even care so much about an eventual prosecution, at this point. He remains "desperate" to simply have someone, anyone, "charged criminally," so he can point the finger and continue to use his favorite "law enforcement" vernacular with even more passion than he has, so far.

By the way, sorry about the informal tone of this email, but, it's an email that I'm writing quickly after having spoken with you by phone today.

There is much more for you to know about the parties Burke is currently involved with in terms of his existing business and legal relationships. Burke has strong ties to the Salinas political family out of Mexico, namely, Emiliano Salinas, the son of former Mexican President Carlos Salinas. Burke has recently been providing legal counsel in a case known as NXIVM (you can google that word to read about it), again, "behind the scenes," while attempting to stay off the radar. On information and Belief Burke's involvement in the NXIVM RICO/Racketeering case is somehow connected to a heiress named Clare Bronfman and her business partner, Emiliano Salinas. I was advised by a liaison attorney for the FBI in the New York area that Burke has been contacting witnesses in the NXIVM case and ins

them to "do things the NXIVM way . . ." (whatever that means.. ) I believe it means Burke was potentially calling witnesses and suggesting they stay quiet. Apologies if this paragraph sounds too dramatic or unprofessional, but, everything written here is 100% true. If confronted, Burke will likely try to minimize his connections to the Salinas regime out of Mexico but they are very real.

Turning back to the Mobile Corp. corporate history. It is not that myself, or Michael Silberman, fear interacting with legal or law enforcement personalities about the corporate history of Mobile Corp. That can be done and has already been done to some extent, for years as we have repeatedly provided voluminous documents to the various parties Burke contacts in his never-ending attempts to paint a non-existent sinister picture of Mobile Corp's corporate history. It is Burke's best-case scenario at the moment to find any possible way to "criminalize" the business history of Mobile Corp. It is difficult for Burke to do so, however, because the many dramatic things he alleges simply are not true.

Burke will likely tell you that my phone call to you was some part of a "scheme." To Burke, with his desire to criminalize Mobile Corp's business history, everything is a "scheme." The words "fraud" and "scheme" are often used by Burke when he contacts Mobile Corp. shareholders in his many attempts to "stir the pot" with his negativity and frequent "law enforcement" vernacular. Yet much to the chagrin of Burke, repeatedly throwing such words against the wall and hoping they stick, is not enough to create criminal conduct when no such conduct occurred.

That being said, we are happy to continue to speak with you and your firm as well, either informally as we did today, or if it be necessary at some point, formally through litigation -- which is not our preference, but we are quite capable of responding and defending what ever you file in court if it should come to that. That is of course going to be your decision although obviously undesired and I would suggest unnecessary. Please understand we are -still- taking steps to attempt to bring Mobile Corp. back to market with a viable product offering, despite Mr. Burke's efforts to "destroy" us and the company to meet his own personal agenda.

My entrepreneurial history, Bill, suggests I have a history of staying with technology projects until they work. It is well documented in SEC filings and press articles that my prior company, Quepasa Corp. struggled for about ten years before it finally settled down as a sustainable, viable going concern. It still trades today with a different name, MeetMe Corp., on the Nasdaq Stock market with a market value of about \$300 million. Burke suggests that history is irrelevant, because it is an old story, but I disagree--I suggest it is still highly relevant as it is a singular story in the history of social networks and technology companies in the U.S.

WE can talk more about all of this at some point. But now at least you have an introductory view of where I'm coming from as it relates to Burke and what I perceive as his efforts to use you, your firm and your Billingsley litigation, to harm certain interests of your client(s), as they may pertain to Mobile Corp. Burke's conduct in attempting to weaponize your litigation to harm myself while harming your client in the process is nefarious, conflicted self-dealing of the worst sort, and Burke. . . again, ought to be ashamed of himself. I hope you won't continue to allow yourself to be duped and used by Burke.

I remain confident there may be a solution to all of this...Burke himself operates on a mix of inaccurate assumptions and actual lies regarding Mobile Corp.'s corporate history. At some point if he can stop behaving like a lunatic who wants to see his former colleagues arrested, and we can get to actual facts supported by documents and the testimony of credible witnesses, things can be much cleaner for all parties. And of course, it goes without saying that much more stands to be gained through a potential return to market by Mobile Corp., than burning down the proverbial house at this point. Such a destructive outcome would only serve Burke's nefarious, anger and revenge laden agenda; it wouldn't help you or any of the other interested parties, at all.

Or maybe I am wrong to be optimistic...?? Maybe it really will all go up in smoke at the end of the day. We shall see. Anyways, you should be aware there's more than one side to Burke's inaccurate story, and the Billingsley litigation does contain mischaracterizations regarding myself and the official corporate history of the Mobile Corp. start-up technology project. It would be a shame to see Mobile Corp. further impeded if Burke tries to use your litigation to slow Mobile Corp.'s potential return to market.

As for the Billingsley real estate project(s), I will reserve commentary for a future conversation. However as previously stated, that real estate project (\$7 million raised?) was Billingsley's thing...myself and Michael Silberman had nothing to do with it. I still don't know why Billingsley had our pictures on his web page. I have not had material business dealings with Billingsley for a number of years now...we have infrequently spoken by phone and informally visited but I am not a part of his real estate business nor was I ever.

Lastly, You may want to think twice before blindly forwarding this email to Burke and continuing to side with him. There's much more to the story. . . some caution may be in order when dealing with Burke. I make this statement in good faith although we have only recently met each other. Be advised I split from my old business partner Marco Lopez (who is close with Burke) in 2014 over Marco's dealings with significant personalities in Mexico. I am just a computer guy at heart who ran a big Spanish language social network. Concepts such as arms trafficking, do

Respectfully,

Jeffrey Peterson  
+16175004980 (desktop phone)  
+18575297781 (mobile)  
email: [jp@jeffreypeterson.com](mailto:jp@jeffreypeterson.com)